

Interview Summary

Application No.
10/020,450

Applicant(s)
Miller et al.

Examiner
Phyllis G. Spivack

Art Unit
1614



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phyllis G. Spivack

(3) Michelle Y. Walker

(2) Carol A. Stratford

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 1, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-62

Identification of prior art discussed:

Wechter, W.J., U.S. Patent 6,555,575; Chopin et al., Brain Research, 784(1-2), 25-36 (Feb., 1998) (abstract).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The two references were discussed as to their potential applicability as art rejections in the present case. It was determined they will not be applied since Chopin is directed to an alpha tocopherol and a parent application of Wechter was applied, and subsequently withdrawn, in Paper Nos. 4 and 12, respectively. Another telephone interview is planned to discuss further which specific metabolites of tocopherols are enabled. The chroman structures (thiochroman or open benzyl ring systems) that are disclosed in the specification on pages 29-33 would be given favorable consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Phyllis Spivack
PHYLLIS SPIVACK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required